

REMARKS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-10, 13, 15-16, 24-26, 39-43, 46 and 48-50 are amended. Claims 2-3, 8, 11-12, 17-18, 21-23, 27-38, 44-45, 47, and 51 are canceled. New claims 52-53 are added. Hence, claims 1, 4-9, 10, 13-16, 19-20, 24-26, 39-43, 46, 48-50 and 52-53 are pending. Based on the arguments below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims in view of the amendments.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Examiner objects to claims 10, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 36 because of informalities. Applicants cancel claims 27-38 and so the objection is moot for those claims. Office Action, p. 5. Regarding claim 10, Applicants fix the antecedent basis for the “network administrator.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the claim objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Examiner rejects claims 10, 17-19, 21-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Office Action, p. 6. Applicants cancel claims 17-18 and 21-23 and so the rejection is moot for those claims.

Applicants amend independent claim 10 which, in part, is reproduced below.

Claim 10 as amended, in part, recites the following:

A network system comprising:

a network;

an authentication server coupled to the network, . . .

wherein the authentication server comprises a Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service (RADIUS) server having RADIUS attributes, . . .

a network switch coupled to the network . . .

wherein the authentication server is operable to: . . .

The claim amendments are supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, Fig. 1, p. 7, lines 1-17; Fig. 5; p. 11 line 15-18, p. 12, line 9.

Applicants contend that the network switch is a machine having software and hardware, and thus it satisfies the statutory subject matter under § 101. Likewise, the authentication server is clarified to comprise a RADIUS server which is a machine. The remaining claims depend from claim 10 and include all limitations of independent claim 10. Hence, claims 10, 19, 24, and 26 satisfy the requirements of § 101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 10, 19, 24, and 26 in view of the amendments.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

- Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,176 of Stewart (hereinafter "Stewart") in view of U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0055924 (hereinafter "Liming").
- Examiner rejects claims 3 and 7 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Liming, further in view of Funk Software, "Comprehensive RADIUS/AAA Solution for the Global Enterprise", 2/22/2003, pages 1-6 (hereinafter "Funk").
- Examiner rejects claims 10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149443 of Torvinen (hereinafter "Torvinen").
- Examiner rejects claims 11, 20, 27-29, 31-37, 39-42, 45, and 47 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0255154 of Kwan (hereinafter "Kwan").
- Examiner rejects claims 17 and 49 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of Liming.

- Examiner rejects claims 23, 25 and 26 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of Funk.
- Examiner rejects claims 30 and 44 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen and Kwan, further in view of Liming.
- Examiner rejects claims 38 and 43 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen and Kwan, further in view of Funk.
- Examiner rejects claim 50 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0045451 of Tan et al. (hereinafter “Tan”).
- Examiner rejects claim 51 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen and Kwan, further in view of Tan.

Applicants cancel claims 2-3, 8, 11-12, 17-18, 21-23, 27-38, 44-45, 47, and 51 and so the rejection is moot for those claims.

Applicants amend claim 1 which is reproduced below. Independent claims 10 and 29 recite similar limitations.

Claim 1 as amended recites the following:

A method of controlling access to a network, the method comprising:

configuring an authentication server to include a first location information corresponding to an identity of a mobile client, the first location information being a location at which the mobile client is permitted to connect to the network,

wherein the authentication server is coupled to the network and comprises a Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service (RADIUS) server having RADIUS attributes, and

wherein the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes;

requesting by a network switch the identity of the mobile client from the mobile client attempting to connect to the network;

receiving, by the authentication server, the identity of the mobile client via the network switch;

associating, by the network switch, a second location information corresponding to the mobile client with the identity of the mobile client, wherein the second location information indicates a location of the network switch coupled to the network to which the mobile client is attempting to connect;

authenticating, by the authentication server, the identity of the mobile client received by the authentication server;

comparing, by the authentication server, the second location information corresponding to the mobile client against the first location information from the VSA;

deciding, by the authentication server, whether to grant or deny access to the network for the mobile client in response to authenticating the identity of the mobile client and in response to comparing the second location information against the first location information; and

informing the network switch by the authentication server whether to grant or deny access to the network for the mobile client.

The claim amendments are supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, Figs. 1-3 and associated paragraphs; Fig. 5; p. 11 line 15-18, p. 12, line 9.

Examiner admits that Stewart does not disclose “that the [second] location information indicates the location of a network switch to which the client is attempting to connect.” Office Action, p. 8. To cure this deficiency, Examiner relies on Liming. Independent claims 10 and 39 recite similar limitations. Examiner also admits that Stewart and Liming do not disclose a RADIUS server. Office Action, pp. 11-12. To cure this deficiency, Examiner relies on Funk.

Funk allegedly discloses a RADIUS/AAA server (Funk, p.1), however, it does not disclose that the authentication server comprises a RADIUS server having RADIUS attributes, and wherein the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes as recited by claim 1. Hence, Funk does not cure the deficiencies of Stewart and Liming. Independent claims 10 and 39 recite similar limitations. Hence, claims 1, 10, and 39 are not obvious by Stewart, Liming, and Funk.

Applicants also contend, as discussed below, that the remaining cited references do not cure the above deficiencies.

Torvinen allegedly discloses a method and system to allow management of restricted group access based upon credentials associated with network terminals. Torvinen, Abstract. However, Torvinen does not disclose that the authentication server is coupled to the network and comprises a Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service (RADIUS) server having RADIUS attributes, and wherein the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes. Therefore, Torvinen does not cure the stated deficiencies of Stewart, Liming, and Funk.

Choi allegedly discloses a handoff method for a mobile station in a wireless local area network. Choi, Abstract. However, Choi does not disclose that the authentication server is coupled to the network and comprises a Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service (RADIUS) server having RADIUS attributes, and wherein the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes. Therefore, Choi does not cure the stated deficiencies of Stewart, Liming, and Funk.

Kwan allegedly discloses “a multiple key, multiple tiered network security system, method and apparatus [that] provides at least three levels of security.” Kwan Abstract. Kwan allegedly discloses an authentication sever 106 that comprises a server that uses the RADIUS for performing user authentication. Id. at par. [0033]. However, Kwan does not disclose that the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes. Therefore, Kwan does not cure the stated deficiencies of Stewart, Liming, and Funk.

Tan allegedly discloses a “method and system for token based user access

authentication [that] enables secure user access to a web server using a token, such as a smart card, and [that] provides a single sign-on mechanism which does not employ a user name and password in the log on process.” Tan, Abstract. However, Tan does not disclose that the authentication server is coupled to the network and comprises a Remote Authentication Dial-In User Service (RADIUS) server having RADIUS attributes, and wherein the first location information is included within a RADIUS vendor specific attribute (VSA) of the RADIUS attributes. Therefore, Tan does not cure the stated deficiencies of Stewart, Liming, and Funk.

Hence, independent claims 1, 10, and 39 are not obvious by the cited references. “If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. The remaining pending claims depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 39 and include all limitations of their respective independent claims. Therefore, the pending claims are not obvious by the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the pending claims.

NEW CLAIMS:

Applicants add new system claims 52-53 that depend from independent claims 10 and 39 respectively. The claims are supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, Fig. 1; p. 10, lines 17-27. As discussed above, independent claims 10 and 39 are not obvious by the cited references. Accordingly, dependent claims 52-53 that include all limitations of their respective independent claims are not obvious by the cited references. Hence, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider the new claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that they have overcome Examiner's objections to and rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as listed in the listing of claims. Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3), Applicants request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and § 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

September 23, 2010

Date

/Usman A. Mughal/

Usman A. Mughal

Reg. No. 62,887

Attorney for Applicants

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: September 23, 2010

/Katherine R. Campbell/

Katherine R. Campbell